



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/335,268

06/17/1999

JOHN S. HENDRICKS

026880.00020

6270

4372

7590

10/02/2006

ARENT FOX PLLC  
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 400  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/335,268	HENDRICKS, JOHN S.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-21, 23-29, 40-50 and 52-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-21, 23-29, 40-50, and 52-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 7/13/2006.

**This action is made Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 13-21, 23-29, 40-50, and 52-58 are pending in the case.

Claims 13, 20, 28, 40, 42, 49, and 57 are independent claims.

### ***Priority***

3. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged CIP of 08/160281, filed on 12/2/93.

### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings filed on 6/17/1999 have been approved by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 20-21, 23, 25-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas et al, hereinafter Lucas (Pat. # 5,499,330, 3/12/96, filed on 9/17/93), in view of Cassorla et al, hereinafter Cassorla (Pat. # 5,146,552, 9/8/92, filed on 2/28/90).

Regarding independent claim 20, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, images (such as a sticker added to the document(s) to help the user find the document later on), etc,—*the displaying step includes displaying the content from the information source as a fully inset image within the displayed portion of the document*-- on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a portion and content from an information source* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents in different display strand configurations (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9, col.19, lines 40-col.20, line12).

Moreover, Lucas teaches changing the display of document objects or pieces of paper arranged in a straight line to an arrangement in a U-shaped manner—*afterward receiving a request for simultaneously displaying the content*--, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books, which contain (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54).

Art Unit: 2178

This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Claim 21 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 12, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of the document objects or pieces of paper in a screen(col.10, lines 29-50).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the displaying of document objects or pieces of paper in a tiled fashion—*side-by-side* (col.10, lines 29-67, fig. 3-4).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*reversing a position of the displayed portion*.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, col.4, lines 3-9,fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the user tiles

Art Unit: 2178

the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*receiving a video signal as the content from the information source* to display the document objects as commanded by the user.

Regarding independent claim 28, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, images (such as a sticker added to the document(s) to help the user find the document later on), etc,—*fully inset image*-- on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a page and content from an information source* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9, col.19, lines 40-col.20, line12).

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. The user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*display a portion of the page otherwise concealed by the inset image*. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). This would provide the

Art Unit: 2178

benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 28, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of the document objects, such as scanned images or pieces of paper in a screen(col. 1, lines 50-54, col.10, lines 29-50). In other words, the image and the document object is moved to a new location by the user, and displayed by the computer.

7. Claims 13-19, 40-50, 52, and 54-58 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas et al, hereinafter Lucas (Pat. # 5,499,330, 3/12/96, filed on 9/17/93), in view of Cassorla et al, hereinafter Cassorla (Pat. # 5,146,552, 9/8/92, filed on 2/28/90), and further in view of Kuno et al, hereinafter Kuno (Pat. # 5,467,102, 11/14/95, continuation filed on 8/31/93).

Regarding independent claim 13, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least one page* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7).

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book, and a viewer having a plurality of hardware screens, each capable*

Art Unit: 2178

*of being physically connected and disconnected.* However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). Kuno teaches the display of a document on two or more separate hardware display screens connected by a hinge. A switching mechanism activates or deactivates the screens for the display of information (col.3, lines 21-67, col.2, lines 12-21, col.3, line 54, col.4, lines 36-67, fig. 1, 2A-B, 10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Kuno because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54), Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1 , lines 34-67), for all the reasons listed by Kuno, including eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1 , lines 34-67). This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, multiple document objects are displayed simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *formatting the page for display on three screens.* However, Kuno teaches the display of a document on two or more separate hardware display screens (col.4, lines 36-67, col.2, lines 12-21, fig. 1, 10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla and, Kuno because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book



Art Unit: 2178

(col.1 , lines 34-67. This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Claim 15 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 12, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *proportional display across the hardware screens*. However, Kuno teaches the display of a document on two separate hardware display screens (col.4, lines 36-67, fig. 1, 10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Kuno because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1 , lines 34-67. This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines

Art Unit: 2178

44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *proportional display across the hardware screens*. However, Kuno teaches the display of a document on two or more separate hardware display screens (col.4, lines 36-67, col.2, lines 12-21, fig. 1, 10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Kuno because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1, lines 34-67. This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects are detected and those that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *detecting a number of hardware screens*. However, Kuno teaches a switch mechanism for the detection of the activation/deactivation of two or more screens, whenever the screens are folded, for not displaying an image of the data on one of the screens (col.3, lines 54-col.4, line 11, col.2, lines 12-21, fig. 1, 2A-B,10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Kuno, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive

Art Unit: 2178

way (col. 1, lines 31-54). Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1, lines 34-67. This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of document objects or pieces of paper in a screen (col.10, lines 29-50). In other words, the document objects that are moved—*detecting change*--, and then displayed as commanded by the user, such as the moving or formatting of entire strands of documents. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *detecting a number of hardware screens*. However, Kuno teaches a switch mechanism for the detection of the activation/deactivation of two or more screens, whenever the screens are folded, for not displaying an image of the data on one of the screens (col.3, lines 54-col.4, line 11, col.2, lines 12-21, fig. 1, 2A-B,10C-D2A-2B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Kuno, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). Kuno discloses eliminating the drudgery of having to switch the pages of an electronic book (col.1 , lines 34-67. This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive, less cumbersome, and more effective.

Art Unit: 2178

Claims 40-50, 52, and 54-58 are directed towards an apparatus for implementing the steps found in claims 13, 15, 13-21, 23, and 25-29 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected. -

8. Claims 24, and 53 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas, in view of Cassorla, and further in view of Levine et al, hereinafter Levine (Pat. # 5,625,833, 4/29/97, continuation filed on 4/7/93).

Regarding independent claim 24, the limitations are directed towards the limitations of claim 20, and therefore are similarly rejected. However, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, and images, on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least one page* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9). Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *wrapping around the displayed content from the information source*. However, Levine teaches automatically wrapping a word to the next line, when a typing cursor comes close by to margins found in the document (col.17, lines 66-col.18, line 12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Levine to wrap text around the document contents, because teaches above automatically aligning the text in accordance to pre-established margins. This has the benefit of allowing whole document portions, such as image, to remain in the document without affecting the layout of the portions, and user to view the whole document.

Claim 53 is directed towards an apparatus for implementing the steps found in claim 24, and therefore is similarly rejected.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 13, 40, and 42, the Applicants indicate that Kuno does not teach the amended limitations which recite displaying the book on hardware screens capable of being physically connected and disconnected (page 29, parag.1). The Examiner disagrees, since Kuno teaches the display of a document on two or more separate hardware display screens. A switching mechanism activates or deactivates the screens for the display of information (col.3, lines 54-67, col.2, lines 12-21, col.3, line 54, col.4, lines 36-67, fig. 1, 2A-B, 10C-D2A-2B). In other words the switching mechanism physically opens and closes the circuit that feeds the electrical signals to the screens.

Regarding claims 20-21, 23, and 76-82, the Applicants note that Lucas fails to teach the content that is separate from the information source as a fully inset image within the displayed portion of the book (page 26, parag.2). The Examiner disagrees, because Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, which contain strings, images (such as a sticker added to the document(s) to help the user find the document later on), etc.--*the displaying step includes displaying the content from the information source as a fully inset image within the displayed*

Art Unit: 2178

*portion of the document-- on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a portion and content from an information source -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents in different display strand configurations in different display strand configurations (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, col.4, lines 3-9, col.19, lines 40-col.20, line12).*

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197.(toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

  
CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
9/28/06